



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,099	06/09/2005	Masanori Sera	260087US0PCT	6203
22850	7590	09/17/2008	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			NUTTER, NATHAN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/17/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/511,099	Applicant(s) SERA ET AL.	
	Examiner Nathan M. Nutter	Art Unit 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 9-18 in the reply filed on 7 August 2008 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that

1) the "invention of Group I overlaps in claim scope with the invention of Group II," and

2) "the subject matter presented in the invention of Group I (claims 9-18) and the invention of Group II (claims 19-28) finds clear support in the previously presented and examined claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-8. By virtue of having issued the Official Action dated March 24, 2008, finally rejecting claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-8, it is reasonable to conclude that the subject matter presented in the inventions of Groups I and II has already been treated on the merits with respect to patentability.

This is not found persuasive because

1) while the search areas overlap, they also diverge, causing undue burden upon the Examiner to search the second claimed invention, and

2) the scope of the claims, all claims, has changed, even as admitted by applicants at page 2 of their Response. The invention of the Group II claims requires an elastomeric resin that would affect the basic and novel characteristics of the composition. The scope of the claims has changed and, as such, restriction for examination purposes is proper.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Art Unit: 1796

It is pointed out that applicants' Response was so confused as to the arguments presented, as to be difficult for the Examiner to parse out the relevant information to each reference in order to respond intelligently on the issues. In future correspondence, applicants will be held non-responsive if the responses are not directed to the rejections, as presented, and not in a blanket fashion.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 9-18 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/577,496 (US 2007/0079825) Sera et al. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the

Art Unit: 1796

copending application claims a composition that may comprise a higher alpha olefin copolymer, a thermoplastic resin and an elastomeric resin blend produced into an article, as recited and claimed herein.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Abe et al (US 5,218,048).

The reference to Abe et al shows the contemplated blend of “a higher α -olefin” polymer which may contain “50 mol% or more” of the monomer. The reference shows the higher alpha olefin homopolymers at column 3 (lines 20-35). The paragraph bridging column 3 to column 4 teaches the use of the thermoplastic resin. Further, note column 3 (lines 56-62) for the molecular weight which would be expected to be within the range of

Art Unit: 1796

claim 4. As regards the MWD of "4.0 or less" there is no indication that the value would or could be higher than one.

The reference shows the resin blend, as pointed out above. The employment of a stereoregular homopolymer of 1-decene would be within the purview of the reference, absent reasoning as to why it would not be. The molecular weight range and molecular weight distribution would also be expected to be within the ranges recited. A skilled artisan would have a high level of expectation of success following the teachings of the reference to arrive at the instantly claimed invention.

As such, the instant claims are deemed to be at least obvious, if not anticipated, by the teachings of the reference.

Claims 9-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Iwata et al (US 5,430,080).

The reference to Iwata et al teaches the manufacture of a blend composition of a thermoplastic resin that, at the paragraph bridging column 6 to column 7 may includes homopolymer of 1-decene with another thermoplastic resin. Though the reference is not specific as to stereoregularity of the poly(1-decene), such would be within the purview of the reference, absent reasoning as to why it would not be. The molecular weight range and molecular weight distribution would also be expected to be within the ranges recited. Since the higher olefin polymer is identical to that recited herein, the melting point would be expected to embrace that of claim 5. The particular catalyst employed in the manufacture of the resin fails to provide any patentable weight to the claims since

Art Unit: 1796

the claims are drawn to a composition. Process claims in a product-by-process situation have been held not to be claim limitations. See SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp., No. 04-1522 (Fed. Cir. February 24, 2006).

As such, the instant claims are deemed to be at least obvious, if not anticipated, by the teachings of the reference.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7 August 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

All prior arguments are being maintained herein.

With regard to the provisional rejection of claims 9-18 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/577,496 (US 2007/0079825) Sera et al, no Terminal Disclaimer has been filed.

With regard to the rejection of claims 9-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Abe et al (US 5,218,048), applicants ignore the teachings pointed out by the Examiner as to the monomers. Further, it is submitted that the monomers disclosed at column 3 (lines 19 et seq.) include many as disclosed in the instant Specification at page 14 (lines 6-13) of 10 to 40 carbon atoms, and a polymer, especially a homopolymer produced therefrom would, indeed, have the melting point range recited herein. Nothing on the record would indicate otherwise. As such, the claims are at least obvious, if not anticipated, by the

Art Unit: 1796

teachings of the patent. Further, each of applicants' assertions is drawn to "examples," "preferred" or "generally" described and not in reference to the broad teachings of the reference. See, applicants' response, page 13, lines 4, 7, 10, 16, 18, 22, 24, etc.. A reference is viewed in the entirety of its teachings and not for isolated examples or passages therein.

With regard to the rejection of claims 9-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Iwata et al (US 5,430,080), again, applicants ignore the teachings pointed out by the Examiner as to the monomers. Further, it is submitted that the poly(1-decene) resin disclosed at column 7 (line 2) would, indeed, have the melting point range recited herein. Nothing on the record would indicate otherwise. As such, the claims are at least obvious, if not anticipated, by the teachings of the patent. Again, each of applicants' assertions is drawn to "examples," "preferred" or "generally" described and not in reference to the broad teachings of the reference. A reference is viewed in the entirety of its teachings and not for isolated examples or passages therein.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan M. Nutter whose telephone number is 571-272-1076. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 a.m.-6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J. Seidleck can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nathan M. Nutter/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

nmn

13 September 2008